



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,133	01/20/2004	Joseph E. Due	13170.8US01	8806

7590 03/23/2005

Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

MULLER, BRYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/761,133	DUE, JOSEPH E. ED	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bryan R Muller	3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "14" and "72" described on page 6 of the specification and reference sign "90" is not in figures 1 or 2 as discussed in the specification on page 4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The reference numbers "14", "72" and "90" are not shown in the drawings as discussed in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 9-11 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rupprecht (5,669,371).

5. In reference to claim 1, Rupprecht discloses an engraver apparatus comprising a carrier having at least one wheel (23) and a main body (1), the main body including a vacuum mount (20), a hand-held engraver (2, 24 and 25) mounted to the carrier, the hand-held engraver being oriented to provide a narrow cut in a working surface and a handle (12 and 13) attached to the main body of the carrier.

6. In reference to claim 9, Rupprecht further discloses a collection tube (21) connecting to the vacuum mount (20) of the carrier and it would be inherent that the vacuum tube would connect to some type of vacuum that would create the suction for the collection tube and collect loose particles.

7. In reference to claim 10, Rupprecht further discloses that the main body (1) of the carrier defines an interior and an exhaust port (between main body and vacuum mount)), the vacuum mount (20) and collection tube (21) providing flow communication between the vacuum and the interior of the main body for evacuation of particles loosened by the engraver.

Art Unit: 3723

8. In reference to claim 11, Rupprecht further discloses that the main body defines an enclosure having a bottom perimeter, and further including a particle containment arrangement that contains particles loosened by the engraver within the enclosure (fig. 2).

9. In reference to claim 30, the method of engraving a concrete working surface using the apparatus of Rupprecht would inherently comprise providing an engraver apparatus, the engraver apparatus including a carrier having a main body (1) defining an enclosure, a handle (12) extending from the main body, and a vacuum mount (20), a hand-held engraver (2, 24 and 25) and a vacuum (as discussed supra) having a vacuum tube (21), attaching the vacuum tube to the vacuum mount of the carrier, mounting the hand-held engraver to the main body of the carrier, operating the hand-held engraver and evacuating particles loosened by the hand-held engraver by operation of the vacuum.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 20, 21, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiuminatta (5,056,499) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904).

Art Unit: 3723

12. In reference to claim 1, Chiuminatta discloses an engraver apparatus comprising a carrier (10) having at least one wheel (14, 16, 18, 20) and a main body (12), a hand-held engraver (32) mounted to the carrier, the hand-held engraver being oriented to provide a narrow cut in a working surface and a handle (58) attached to the main body of the carrier. Chiuminatta, however, fails to disclose that the main body includes a vacuum mount. Due discloses an apparatus for mounting a hand-held grinding tool that comprises a vacuum mount (134) for attachment to a vacuum (14) to collect loose debris that may effect the function of the hand-held tool or may create hazardous working conditions for an operator such as flying debris, inhalation of dusty air, or slippery surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the engraver apparatus of Chiuminatta with a vacuum mount on the main body attach a vacuum to collect any loose debris caused by the operation of the tool.

13. In reference to claim 2, Chiuminatta further discloses that the hand-held engraver is removable from the carrier as a separate, operable unit including an elongated housing (32) having a handle portion (56) and a rotary head (34) interconnected to the elongated housing.

14. In reference to claim 3, Chiuminatta fails to disclose a switch or a power source for the motor (32) of the engraving tool. Due discloses an operating switch (82) for the separate, operable unit (76) that must inherently be electrically connected to the power cord (110) to properly function. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the engraver tool

Art Unit: 3723

of Chiuminatta with a power cord to provide power and an operating switch to control the power source supplied to the tool.

15. In reference to claim 4, Chiuminatta further discloses a mounting arrangement (42, 44 and 46) that detachably mounts the hand-held engraver to the carrier.

16. In reference to claim 5, Chiuminatta fails to disclose that the mounting arrangement is adjustable, the hand-held engraver being mountable to the carrier in a plurality of positions relative to the working surface. Due discloses a mounting apparatus that detachably mounts the hand-held tool and is adjustable to mount the tool in a plurality of positions relative to the working surface. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the engraver tool of Chiuminatta with a mounting arrangement similar to the one disclosed by Due to allow for the hand-held tool to be mounted in a plurality of positions to provide the operator with the ability to adjust the tool to produce the desired finish on the working surface.

17. In reference to claim 7, the adjustable mounting arrangement of Due is also capable of accepting varying sizes of tools, therefore, the same mounting arrangement applied to the apparatus of Chiuminatta would be capable of accepting varying sizes of hand-held engravers.

18. In reference to claim 8, the adjustable mounting arrangement of Due includes first and second brackets (45 and 88), each of the first and second brackets having a horizontal slot (42 and 148, respectively) to vary the distance between the first and second brackets to accept varying sizes of hand-held engravers.

Art Unit: 3723

19. In reference to claim 20, Chiuminatta further discloses that the carrier includes two wheels (18 and 20) positioned adjacent a first end of the carrier, each of the two wheels extending outward from opposite sides of the carrier.

20. In reference to claim 21, Chiuminatta further discloses that one (18) of the two wheels extends a distance farther from the respective side of the carrier than the other wheel.

21. In reference to claim 24, Chiuminatta discloses a carrier (10) for use with a hand-held engraver (32), the carrier comprising an enclosure (40 and 12) having a rear region and a front region, an engraver mount (42, 44 and 46) for detachably mounting the hand-held engraver to the enclosure, a handle (58) attached to the enclosure for moving the carrier during operation of the detachably mounted hand-held engraver and at least one wheel (14, 16, 18 or 20) attached to the enclosure to accommodate the movement of the carrier during operation. Chiuminatta, however, fails to disclose a vacuum tube mounting arrangement for attaching a vacuum tube to the enclosure. Due discloses an apparatus for mounting a hand-held grinding tool that comprises a vacuum tube mounting arrangement (134) for attaching a vacuum tube (58) to the enclosure to collect loose debris and it would be have been obvious, in view of Due to provide the apparatus of Chiuminatta with a similar vacuum tube mounting arrangement (134) for attaching a vacuum tube (58) to the enclosure to collect loose debris, as discussed supra.

22. In reference to claim 26, Chiuminatta fails to discloses a particle containment arrangement but Due further discloses a particle containment arrangement (83) for containing particles and dust within an interior of the enclosure (the enclosure fully

Art Unit: 3723

covers the working part (85) of the tool and would therefore prevent at least some of the particles and dust from leaving the enclosure before entering the vacuum tube.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the enclosure of Chiuminatta such that it fully enclosed the working part of the hand-held engraver tool, as taught by Due, in order to prevent at least some of the particles and dust from leaving the enclosure so that more of the particles and dust may be collected by the vacuum tube than if the enclosure was open on any side of the working part of the tool.

23. Claims 1, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (5,429,420) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904).

24. In reference to claim 1, Johnson discloses an engraver apparatus comprising a carrier (10) having at least one wheel (18, 20, 22, 24) and a main body (12), a hand-held engraver (14 and 16) mounted to the carrier, the hand-held engraver being oriented to provide a narrow cut in a working surface and a handle (89) attached to the main body of the carrier. Johnson, however, fails to disclose that the main body includes a vacuum mount. Due discloses an apparatus for mounting a hand-held grinding tool that comprises a vacuum mount (134) for attachment to a vacuum (14) to collect loose debris that may effect the function of the hand-held tool or may create hazardous working conditions for an operator such as flying debris, inhalation of dusty air, or slippery surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the engraver apparatus of

Art Unit: 3723

Johnson with a vacuum mount on the main body attach a vacuum to collect any loose debris caused by the operation of the tool.

25. In reference to claim 15, Johnson further discloses that the engraver apparatus includes a stop (knobs 62 and slots 58 are adjustable to change the orientation of wheels 8 and 20 with reference to the main body such that the wheels act as the stops) positioned on the carrier that limits a depth of engraving provided by the hand-held engraver.

26. In reference to claim 17, Johnson further discloses that the main body defines an interior and an exterior, the main body further including a slot extending from the exterior to the interior of the main body. The slot, which extends from the exterior to the interior of the main body to allow a drive shaft (101) to pass from the outside to the inside, is best shown in figure 5c.

27. In reference to claim 18, Johnson further discloses that the hand-held engraver is mounted at the slot such that a disc of the hand-held engraver is positioned within the interior of the main body and a housing (16) of the hand-held engraver is positioned at the exterior of the main body.

28. In reference to claim 19, Johnson further discloses that the slot is located in a recess (formed by part 74 of the main body as seen in figure 8) found in the main body of the carrier.

29. Claims 1, 16, 20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger (6,478,666) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904).

Art Unit: 3723

30. In reference to claim 1, Berger discloses an engraver apparatus comprising a carrier (9) having at least one wheel (2) and a main body (1), a hand-held engraver (12) mounted to the carrier, the hand-held engraver being oriented to provide a narrow cut in a working surface and a handle (3) attached to the main body of the carrier. Berger, however, fails to disclose that the main body includes a vacuum mount. Due discloses an apparatus for mounting a hand-held grinding tool that comprises a vacuum mount (134) for attachment to a vacuum (14) to collect loose debris that may effect the function of the hand-held tool or may create hazardous working conditions for an operator such as flying debris, inhalation of dusty air, or slippery surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the engraver apparatus of Berger with a vacuum mount on the main body attach a vacuum to collect any loose debris caused by the operation of the tool.

31. In reference to claim 16, Berger further discloses that the main body of the carrier includes a recess (between 22 and 8 in fig. 3) sized for receipt of the hand-held engraver.

32. In reference to claim 20, Berger further discloses that the carrier includes two wheels positioned adjacent a first end of the carrier, each of the two wheels extending outward from opposite sides of the carrier.

33. In reference to claim 24, Berger discloses a carrier (9) for use with a hand-held engraver (12), the carrier comprising an enclosure (6) having a rear region and a front region, an engraver mount (19-22 and 11) for detachably mounting the hand-held engraver to the enclosure, a handle (3) attached to the enclosure for moving the carrier

Art Unit: 3723

during operation of the detachably mounted hand-held engraver and at least one wheel (2) attached to the enclosure to accommodate the movement of the carrier during operation. Berger, however, fails to disclose a vacuum tube mounting arrangement for attaching a vacuum tube to the enclosure. Due discloses an apparatus for mounting a hand-held grinding tool that comprises a vacuum tube mounting arrangement (134) for attaching a vacuum tube (58) to the enclosure to collect loose debris and it would be obvious, in view of Due to provide the apparatus of Berger with a similar vacuum tube mounting arrangement (134) for attaching a vacuum tube (58) to the enclosure to collect loose debris, as discussed supra.

34. In reference to claim 25, Berger further discloses that the engraver mount is configured to detachably mount the engraver in a generally vertical orientation.

35. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiuminatta (5,056,499) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904) as applied to claim 4 and further in view of Johnson (5,429,420).

36. The obvious combination of Chiuminatta and Due, as discussed supra, fails to disclose that the adjustable mounting arrangement includes brackets having vertical slots to mount the hand-held engraver at various heights relative to the working surface. Also discussed supra are the vertical slots disclosed by Johnson for mounting the hand-held engraver at various heights relative to the working surface. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the mounting brackets of Due with vertical slots to allow the height of the

hand-held engraver to be adjusted in order to allow the operator to set the height of the engraver to adjust the depth of the cut to provide the working surface with a desired finish.

37. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupprecht ('371) as applied to claim 11 and further in view of Santos (5,908,224).

38. Rupprecht fails to disclose that the particle containment arrangement includes brushes located along a majority of the bottom perimeter of the enclosure. Santos discloses an engraver apparatus with a vacuum system to collect debris and provides brushes along the majority of the bottom of enclosure (11) to help collect any loose debris and move it towards the vacuum collection device and to help prevent any debris from being thrown out of the enclosure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide brushes to the majority of the perimeter of the enclosure of Rupprecht, as taught by Santos, to help collect any loose debris and move it towards the vacuum collection device and to help prevent any debris from being thrown out of the enclosure.

39. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupprecht ('371) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Chiuminatta (5,579,753).

40. Rupprecht discloses that the main body has a rear region and a front region but fails to disclose that the main body further includes an opening at the front region to monitor operation of the engraver apparatus. Chiuminatta ('753) discloses an

Art Unit: 3723

apparatus to provide a narrow cut in a working surface and teaches that openings may be provided around the cutting blade of the tool that are covered with a see through guard to allow the operator to monitor operation of the engraver (col. 31, lines 50-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an opening in the front region (closest to the operator) of the enclosure of Rupprecht with an opening covered by a see through guard, as taught by Chiuminatta ('753), to allow the operator to monitor operation of the engraver apparatus while still being protected from any flying debris.

41. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupprecht ('371) in view of Chiuminatta (5,579,753) as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Mertes (5,215,071).

42. The obvious combination of Rupprecht and Chiuminatta, as discussed supra, fails to disclose a light positioned to illuminate the area adjacent to the opening at the front region to assist in monitoring operation of the engraver. Mertes discloses a riding pavement saw with a spotlight (46) mounted at the front area to illuminate the work area (col. 4, lines 42-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a spotlight, as taught by Mertes to illuminate the area adjacent to the opening (only place the light would reach the engraver blade because other than the opening, the blade is covered by the enclosure) at the front region of the Rupprecht and Chiuminatta combination to assist in monitoring operation of the engraver.

43. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger (6,478,666) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904) as applied to claim 20 and further in view of Farenholtz (Pub.No. 2002/0106619 A1).

44. In reference to claim 22, the obvious combination of Berger and Due, as discussed supra, discloses a wheel positioned adjacent to a second end (opposite the first end) of the carrier fails to disclose that the wheel is a ball wheel. Farenholtz teaches that a ball wheel is movable in any direction, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a ball wheel in place of the wheel of Berger, adjacent to the second end of the carrier, so that the carrier would be easier to move in any direction by the operator.

45. In reference to claim 23, the ball wheel (replacing the single wheel closest to the engraver blade of Berger) adjacent to the second end and the two wheels positioned adjacent to the first end of the carrier are arranged in a triangular configuration.

46. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiuminatta (5,056,499) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904) as applied to claim 24 and further in view of Santos ('224).

47. The obvious combination of Chiuminatta and Due, as discussed supra, fails to disclose that the particle containment arrangement includes brushes located along a majority of the perimeter of the enclosure. Santos discloses an engraver apparatus with brushes along the majority of the bottom of enclosure (11) to help collect any loose

Art Unit: 3723

debris and move it towards the vacuum collection device and to help prevent any debris from being thrown out of the enclosure, as discussed supra. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide brushes to the majority of the perimeter of the enclosure of the Chiuminatta and Due combination, as taught by Santos, to help collect any loose debris and move it towards the vacuum collection device and to help prevent any debris from being thrown out of the enclosure.

48. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiuminatta (5,056,499) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904) as applied to claim 24 and further in view of Chiuminatta (5,579,753).

49. The obvious combination of Chiuminatta ('499) and Due, as discussed supra, discloses that the main body has a rear region and a front region but fails to disclose that the main body further includes an opening at the front region to monitor operation of the engraver apparatus. Chiuminatta ('753) discloses an apparatus to provide a narrow cut in a working surface and teaches that openings may be provided around the cutting blade of the tool that are covered with a see through guard to allow the operator to monitor operation of the engraver (col. 31, lines 50-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an opening the enclosure in the front region (closest to the operator) of the enclosure of the Chiuminatta ('499) and Due combination with an opening covered by a see through

Art Unit: 3723

guard, as taught by Chiuminatta ('753), to allow the operator to monitor operation of the engraver apparatus while still being protected from any flying debris.

50. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger (6,478,666) in view of Due (Pub.No. 2003/0127904) as applied to claim 24 and further in view of Mertes (5,215,071).

51. The obvious combination of Berger and Due, as discussed supra, fails to disclose a light attached to the handle. Mertes discloses a riding pavement saw with a spotlight (46) mounted at the front area to illuminate the work area (col. 4, lines 42-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Berger and Due combination with a spotlight to illuminate the work area, as taught by Mertes. It further would have been obvious to attach the spotlight to the handle of the Berger and Due combination because it is the only location that is far enough from the work area to produce a large area of light and it would be easier for the operator to reposition the light or turn the light on and off.

Conclusion

52. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Iida (Pub.No. 2001/0003983A1), Yamami (6,047,693), Duncan (5,074,044) and Gnazzo (6,318,352) all disclose hand-held engravers with vacuum systems and Halstead (6,349,712) and Bearden (6,112,736) disclose apparatus' for mounting hand-held tools to provide a narrow cut in a working surface.

Art Unit: 3723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan R Muller whose telephone number is (571) 272-4489. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J Hail III can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BRM

3/16/2005



Joseph J. Hail, III
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700